

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner found the title not to be descriptive and requires a new title. The title has been amended herewith.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Rader et al. The Examiner specifically refers to Figures 3A and 6 of Rader. The Examiner rejects claims 6-8, 10-12, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Rader et al. in view of Kotowski et al. The Examiner states the Kotowski discloses that it is known in the art to provide the arrangement of the capacitors in an array like connection.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither reference, either singly or in combination either shows or suggests that the output voltage can be controlled in a stepwise manner in accordance with the equation $V_{out} = [1 + 1/(N+1)]$, as now recited in Claim 6. Claim 6 has been made the independent claim and Claim 1 cancelled without prejudice.

Furthermore, none of the references either singly or in combination shows that the duty ratio of the first phase can be set according to the $1/(N+1)$ and the duty ratio of the second phase can be set at $N/(N+1)$, as recited in Claim 8. Accordingly, these claims are clearly distinguished over the referenced cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has found Claim 5 to be allowable as well as Claims 9, 13, 17 and 20 which are objected to as being dependent upon and rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claim 5 has been amended to be an independent claim by combining it with Claim 1. Claims 9 and 13 are directly dependent upon Claim 6 and Claim 17 is indirectly independent upon Claim 6. The patentability of Claim 6 having been shown above, these claims are patentable for the

S/N 10/763,292

same reasons. Claim 20 has remained unchanged, as Claim 5 has been converted to an independent claim and Claim 20 is dependent therefrom. Accordingly, this claim should now be in condition for allowance, as well.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452